

**SECTION III**

**WHOLE SCHOOL REFORM  
PROGRESS REPORT**

**CHART III**  
**FINAL PERFORMANCE REPORT**  
**WHOLE SCHOOL REFORM IMPLEMENTATION STATUS**  
**1999-2000**

Revised 7/24/00

**DISTRICT: NEWARK**

**DATE: June 30, 2000**

	SCHOOL	TYPE*	GRADE LEVEL	COHORT	MODEL	STATUS & BARRIERS
1	Abington Ave	E	K-8	III	CES	Contract Negotiations/Scheduling Training
2	Alexander St	E	K-5	III	Accelerated	Contract Negotiations/Scheduling Training
3	Ann St	E	K-8	III	Comer	Contract Negotiations/Scheduling Training
4	Arts High	S	9-12	III	Talent Devel. HS or CES	Tentative/ Selection scheduled for Jan. '01
5	Avon Ave	E	K-8	II	SFA	Implementing
6	Barringer High	S	9-12	III	TDHS, HSTW or CES	Tentative/Selection scheduled for Jan. '01
7	Belmont Runyon	E	K – 6	II	SFA	Implementing
8	Boylan St	E	K – 1	I	SFA	Implementing
9	Bragaw Ave	E	K- 8	III	Accelerated	Contract Negotiations/Scheduling Training
10	Branch Brook	E	K – 5	II A	Accelerated	Implementing
11	Broadway Elem	E	K – 4	III	Accelerated	Contract Negotiations/Scheduling Training
12	Bruce St	E		II A	MicroSociety	Contract Negotiations/Scheduling Training
13	Burnett St	E	K – 8	III	America's Choice	Contract Negotiations/Scheduling Training
14	Camden St	E	K – 4	II A	CFL	Implementing
15	Camden Middle	M	5 – 8	III	CO'NECT	Tentative/ Selection scheduled for Jan. 01
16	Central High	S	9 – 12	III	TDHS	Contract Negotiations/Scheduling Training
17	Chancellor Ave	E	K – 8	III	Comer	Contract Negotiations/Scheduling Training
18	Chancellor Annex	E	K – 3	III	Comer	Contract Negotiations/Scheduling Training
19	Cleveland	E	K – 5	II A	SFA	Contract Negotiations/Scheduling Training
20	Clinton Ave	E	K – 2	II	Comer	Implementing
21	Dayton St	E	K – 8	II	SFA	Implementing
22	Dr E. A. Flagg	E	K – 8	III	CES	Contract Negotiations/Scheduling Training
23	Dr. M. L. King	E	K – 8	II	CFL	Implementing
24	Dr. W.H.Horton	E	K – 8	II A	Accelerated	Implementing
25	East Side High	S	9 – 12	II A	Coalition	Implementing
26	Eighteenth Ave	E	K – 4	II A	SFA	Contract Negotiations/Scheduling Training
27	Elliott Ave	E	K – 5	II	SFA	Implementing
28	Fifteenth Ave	E	K – 8	II	CFL	Implementing
29	First Ave	E	K – 8	II A	Accelerated	Implementing
30	Fourteenth Ave	E	K – 4	II A	CFL	Implementing
31	Franklin	E	K – 5	II A	Accelerated	Implementing
32	Gateway Acad	Alt.		N/A	N/A	
33	George W Carver	E	K – 8	II	SFA or Comer	Implementing
34	Gladys H-Jones	M	5 – 8	III	Accelerated	Implementing
35	Harold Wilson	M	5-8	III	America's Choice	Contract Negotiations/Scheduling Training
36	Harriet Tubman	E	K-6	III	Comer	Contract Negotiations/Scheduling Training
37	Hawkins St	E	K-5	III	Accelerated	Contract Negotiations/Scheduling Training
38	Hawthorne	E	K – 8	III	SFA	Tentative Selection

\* E = Elementary    M = Middle    S = Secondary

**CHART III**  
**FINAL PERFORMANCE REPORT**  
**WHOLE SCHOOL REFORM IMPLEMENTATION STATUS**  
**1999-2000**

Revised 7/24/00

**DISTRICT: NEWARK**

**DATE: June 30, 2000**

	SCHOOL	TYPE*	GRADE LEVEL	COHORT	MODEL	STATUS & BARRIERS
39	John F Kennedy	E		II A	Comer	Implementing
40	Lafayette Annex	E	K – 8	II	Accelerated	Implementing
41	Lincoln	E	K – 5	II	Comer	Implementing
42	Louise A Spencer	E	K – 8	II	SFA	Implementing
43	Luis Munoz Marin	M	5 - 8	II	CFL	Implementing
44	Madison Ave	E	K – 6	II	SFA	Implementing
45	Malcolm X Shabazz	S	9 – 12	II	Talent Develop H.S.	Implementing
46	Maple Ave/Annex	E	K – 8	III	SFA	Contract Negotiations/Scheduling Training
47	McKinley	E	K – 5	II A	Accelerated	Implementing
48	Miller Str	E	K – 5	II	SFA	Implementing
49	Montgomery	S	Sp Ed	II A	CFL	Contract Negotiations/Scheduling Training
50	Morton St	M	5 – 8	III	America's Choice	Tentative/Selection scheduled for Jan. '01
51	Mount Vernon	E	K – 8	II A	Accelerated	Implementing
52	NJ Regional Day	N/A				
53	Newark Evening	N/A				
54	Newton St	E	K – 8	III	SFA (Proj Grad)	Contract Negotiations/Scheduling Training
55	Oliver St	E	K – 8	II A	Accelerated	Implementing
56	Peshine Ave	E	K – 8	II	SFA	Implementing
57	Quitman St	E	K – 4	II A	Comer	Implementing
58	Rafael Hernandez	E	K – 8	III	<i>America's Choice</i>	Contract Negotiations/Scheduling Training
59	Ridge St	E	K – 8	II A	Accelerated	Implementing
60	Roberto Clemente	E	K – 4	II A	SFA	Implementing
61	Roseville Ave	E	K – 3	II A	Accelerated	Implementing
62	Samuel Berlinger	E	Sp Ed	II A	Comer	Implementing
63	Science High	S	9 – 12	III	Ill. Math Science Acad	Tentative/ Selection scheduled for Jan. '01
64	South 17 <sup>th</sup> St	E	K – 8	II A	Accelerated	Implementing
65	South St	E	K – 5	II A	Comer	Implementing
66	Speedway Ave	E	K – 4	II	SFA	Implementing
67	Sussex Ave	E	K – 8	III	SFA	Contract Negotiations/Scheduling Training
68	Technology	S	9 – 12	III	HSTW	Tentative/ Selection scheduled for Jan. '01
69	Thirteenth Ave	E	K – 8	III	Comer	Contract Negotiations/Scheduling Training
70	University High	S	7 – 12	III	CES	Contract Negotiations/Scheduling Training
71	Vailsburg Middle	M	5 – 8	III	CO'NECT	Contract Negotiations/Scheduling Training
72	Warren Street	E	K – 8	II	SFA	Implementing
73	Weequahic High	S	9 – 12	III	TDHS	Tentative/ Selection scheduled for Jan. '01
74	West Kinney Alt	S	9 – 12	III	CES, HSTW, CM	Tentative/ Selection scheduled for Jan. '01
75	West Side High	S	9 - 12	III	TDHS	Tentative/ Selection scheduled for Jan. '01
76	William Brown	M	4 – 8	II	SFA	Implementing
77	Wilson Ave	E	K – 8	II	Accelerated	Implementing

\* E = Elementary    M = Middle    S = Secondary

## **Barriers and Issues to Implementation of Whole School Reform**

The Newark Public Schools has taken the Abbott regulations as an opportunity to reinvent itself. All of our schools were actively engaged in the Whole School Reform process and as the chart indicates, at varying levels of implementation. All Cohorts I and II schools implemented their selected Whole School Reform models.

Schools considered as IIA were provided with technical assistance to prepare and submit their incentive grant applications and are in the process of preparing for the implementation of their model. These twenty-two (22) schools will be developing their implementation plans and school based budgets by December 1, 2000, with the sixteen (16) schools in Cohort III.

In spite of what we can now call successes, there were barriers to the implementation of Whole School Reform in the Newark Public Schools. The most significant barrier was time. The time factor was a major deterrent in the ability of School Management Teams to effectively meet to deal with the governance issues and their myriad new roles and responsibilities. The element of time is also an issue relative to the staff development required for Whole School Reform. Currently, the Newark Public Schools has four staff development days on the calendar for the year, when most models require more days of staff development for successful implementation of the model. Additionally, time becomes an issue with regards to the required planning meetings that teachers need to prepare to implement. Since the Newark Public Schools is still a district where our principals are ten (10) month employees, time once again becomes an implementation issue/barrier.

Beyond the need for more time and additional staff development days, there must be creative and skilled scheduling in our schools to support the turnkey training that some of the models require. Creative scheduling is also needed to ensure that teachers are provided the needed time to meet in grade clusters to plan for the implementation of the Whole School Reform models and to analyze data to improve instruction. The schedule can also support the active participation of parents and community in the schools, as well as school management team members.

The most difficult timelines are those that the Abbott regulations placed on the districts through law and code requirements. The development of an implementation plan, based on a solid, data-driven needs assessment, the completion of a school-based budget, and the uploading to the DOENET in a large urban district was nearly impossible. In Newark, this was compounded by budgets that were not produced using GAAP codes, since GAAP account codes had not been used in completing the previous year's budget.

Another issue was that of reconstituting our school management teams to four constituent groups, with none greater than 49%, per code requirement. However, the School Development Program (Comer) required a very extensive governance structure representative of all teachers in the building. Therefore, fundamentally there is a dichotomy between the regulations and the model. Other instances, such as with the SFA model, where numerous staff (those subject area specialist who do not have an

elementary certification) cannot teach during the SFA reading block. However, substitutes with much less experience can be hired for this purpose.

The last issue which we address is that of the only elementary school in Newark, which has not selected a model. Hawthorne Avenue School had two years to explore a model. As the other schools were taking their votes for a Whole School Reform model, Hawthorne was considering SFA. In January of 2000, the school's school management team recommended the SFA model and the staff wanted to vote, however, the preliminary awareness session had not been conducted by SFA. This is a requirement and without it, a vote cannot be valid. The developer presented the awareness session between February and March. In March, a vote was taken, but the 80% required staff commitment to the model was not attained.

From March through May, the WSR supervisor for SLT III discussed SFA and the School Development Program (Comer) models with the staff. Two additional votes were taken, and again neither model received the required percentage. Consequently, on June 8, 2000 there was a meeting at the school attended by the Assistant Superintendent of SLT III, the WSR district point person, the PIRC-N liaison, and another PIRC liaison who served as a mediator. At this session the instructional staff was addressed and a survey was completed and collected. Of the surveys returned, there was an indication that there still an interest in SFA and Comer.

On June 9, 2000 another vote was taken and again the school failed to attain the 80%. At this session, teachers started to express their frustration and voiced their sense of being intimidated and pressured to select a model. The Deputy Superintendent visited the school and spoke with staff members. She also spoke one-on-one with the SMT chairperson, the NTU representative, the administrative team, and another teacher. As a result of their expressed interest in hearing from the Comer developer, Sherri Joseph came to the school on June 22<sup>nd</sup> to present. There were many questions from those present, even though many teachers did not attend.

The Deputy Superintendent spoke, again, with the NTU representative to ensure that the that the process would begin early in September. It was the opinion of the NTU representative that the staff would move forward upon their return to school in September and select a model.

In September 2000, a plan of action was developed and as of September 12<sup>th</sup>, the plan has been put into action. On that date, a discussion was held with the faculty of Hawthorne Avenue School. At that meeting the discussion included: needs of school, review of models, WSR implementation plan. The WSR supervisor presented several options and the staff elected to see and hear from America's Choice before making a decision. On Monday, September 18<sup>th</sup>, the developer presented to the staff and the district is arranging for a visit to Plainfield. A vote is scheduled for September 26, 2000.

## **STATEMENT OF ASSURANCE**

### **ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN**

The Newark Public Schools' Accountability Plan was developed to affirm that staff can and must demonstrate high levels of performance to meet the district's standards. At this point the Accountability Plan has addressed those steps that are related to the collection and analysis of data. To this end the 99-00 school year served to provide baseline data. As described in the Accountability Plan, the district has developed yearly benchmarks and established four-year targets. The data collected this year will be used to modify these goals and targets.

Interim assessments of student progress were conducted via criterion-referenced tests and, midterms. Based on the analysis, interventions were provided through the School Leadership Team Office (SLT) and the Department of Teaching and Learning. The analysis of this data and the intervention strategies are provided as part of this annual report.

Other non-test data related activities that would have been measured by rubrics have not been assessed because the rubrics are still being developed. During the 99-00 school year, an Accountability Committee was formed to identify additional target areas and develop appropriate rubrics. The additional target areas identified are: (1) increase the percentage of students ready to proceed to the next grade in kindergarten and 1<sup>st</sup> grade, (2) decrease the percentage of students in the lowest quartile and concurrent increase the percentage of students in the highest quartile for grades 2,3,5,6,7,9 and 10, (3) decrease the percentage of students in the lowest proficiency level and an increase the percentage of students in the highest proficiency level in grades 4 and 8 as measured by the ESPA and GEPA, (4) increase the percentage of students passing all three sections of the HSPT in grade 11, (5) a decrease in the percentage of students absent 10 days or more, (6) a decrease the percentage of students who drop-out in grade 9, and (7) develop targets for increased enrollment in higher level classes and increased performance on higher level tests such as AP and SAT.

During the 00-01 school year, the Accountability Committee will ensure that the targets are set, the rubrics are developed and expanded awards and interventions will be identified and implemented as per the action steps identified in the Accountability Plan.